

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_119029
Title of the Manuscript:	READING MOTIVATION AND READING COMPREHENSION OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL LEARNERS: A DESCRIPTIVE-CORRELATIONAL APPROACH
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- The results of the study are interesting, and can makes theoretical, practical, and contextual contributions in the discipline of social sciences. Minor revisions in the paper will certainly benefit the readers as a whole.</p> <p>2- The title of the paper is novel, interesting and according the scope of the study</p> <p>3- The abstract of article is nicely, logically, and precisely written, covering all component of article format.</p> <p>4- The author followed the structure, format of article. The subsection and structure of the manuscript is according to the set pattern. But surprisingly the <b>discussion part</b> is ahead of data analysis, results and findings. Discussion part ought to be after analysis results. Authors should readjust the discussion part at its logical position.</p> <p>5- This study relates to social Sciences, not to real science. Technically the format of manuscript is correct subject to minor suggested revisions.</p> <p>6- Although the references are recent, but some References e.g no 12 and 40 are too old to refer. Replace with latest references. Reference no 2, 6, 14, 16, 20, 22, 23, 29, 31, 35, 41 have spacing and alignment issue, which need to be modify according to APA 7<sup>th</sup> Manual. Reference no 45 alphabetically not arranged. Referencing needs improvement and revision according to the APA 7<sup>th</sup> Manual. Table 03 also need highlighted correction.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Overall the manuscript is well structured, written, with great clarity, smoothness, and good logic. The language and expression quality meets the expectations of the reader. To sum up, the article accomplished the laid out research objectives. Having said that, there are some spellings and grammatical mistake which have been highlighted in the main body. The manuscript needs minor revisions/ corrections before acceptance/ publication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>After a careful review of this article, the reviewer is in the opinion that draft should be published after minor revisions/ corrections that are being pointed out in the observation sheet.</p>	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abdul Shakoor Rana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Okara, Pakistan</b>